



108

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

COCP-6166-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.04.2026

Hardyal Sidhu

...Petitioner

Versus

Milan Dubey

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Jhanji, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sumit Narang, Advocate and
Mr. Shashank Sharma, Advocate for the respondent.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Contempt Petition filed under Section 10 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for her willful and intentional disobedience of the order dated 29.07.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court.

2. On 05.03.2026, this Court had passed the following order:-

*“Present:- Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Jhanji, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sumit Narang, Advocate and
Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate for the respondent
along with
Ms. Nidhi Sharma, Assistant General Manager,
Deputy Zonal Head (Disciplinary Authority) UCO
Bank, Zonal Office, Ludhiana
(Through Video Conferencing).*



Learned Senior Counsel for the respondent has submitted that respondent has reconsidered the matter and instead of passing an order of dismissal, order of removal from services has been passed on 03.03.2026 and a copy of the said order dated 03.03.2026 has been handed over to the Court during the course of the day, which is taken on record and marked as Mark "A" and a copy of the same has been given to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned Senior Counsel for the respondent has highlighted that a perusal of the major penalties which the respondent-authority is entitled to invoke would show that dismissal from service is a punishment which can ordinarily be a disqualification for future employment whereas removal from service is not a disqualification for future employment and thus, removal from service although is a major penalty, but is a lesser punishment than dismissal from service.

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for a short adjournment to get instructions in the matter.

Adjourned to 19.03.2026.

To be taken up in the urgent list.

Presence of Ms. Nidhi Sharma, Assistant General Manager, Deputy Zonal Head (Disciplinary Authority) UCO Bank, Zonal Office, Ludhiana is exempted till further orders.

05.03.2026"

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that subsequent to the passing of the abovesaid order, the petitioner has given a representation dated 20.03.2026 for release of the pension and terminal benefits as it is the case of the petitioner that even in case of removal from service, the petitioner is entitled to the same. It is submitted that the respondent be directed to decide the said representation expeditiously in a time bound manner. It is further submitted that in case the respondent finds merits in the representation of the petitioner then necessary amount due to the petitioner be also released expeditiously. It is



further stated that in case the respondent is to reject the said representation then speaking order be passed and petitioner be also granted liberty to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law both with respect to order of removal as well as order which is proposed to be passed on representation dated 20.03.2026.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the respondent has submitted that they would consider the representation dated 20.03.2026 in accordance with law and would pass a speaking order in accordance with law within a period of one month from today.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present contempt petition is disposed of with the following observations/directions:-

- i) The respondent as undertaken before this Court would decide the representation dated 20.03.2026 within a period of one month from today and in case representation of the petitioner is found to be meritorious then respondent would release the amount which as per them is due to the petitioner within further period of six weeks.
- ii) In case respondent finds that the representation of the petitioner is not meritorious then a detailed speaking order regarding the same would be passed within a period of one month from today.
- iii) It would be open to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law in case any cause survives subsequent to the respondent considering the representation dated 20.03.2026.

6. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

01.04.2026

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No